LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U. S.

Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
MAR 30 1970
JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1970
No. [redacted] 119

CORA MCKINNON,

Appellant,

vs.

WILLIE BROWN,

Appellee.

On Appeal From the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Riverside (Appellate Department).

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT.

WILLIAM BOONE ELEY, ESQ.,
DAVID ARTHUR BINDER, ESQ.,
Legal Aid Society Building,
3890 Tenth Street,
Riverside, Calif. 92501,
(714) 683-7108,
Counsel for Appellant.

Parker & Son, Inc., Law Printers, Los Angeles. Phone 685-9790

SUBJECT INDEX

	Page
Opinion Below	1
Jurisdiction	2
Statutes Involved	3
Statement of the Case and How the Federal Question Is Presented	4
The Question Is Substantial	12
Conclusion	15
Appendix A. Judgment of the Municipal Court; Decision on Appeal Rendered by Superior Court and Denial of Motion for Certification.	
Appendix B. Pertinent Statutes, Rules and Constitutional Amendments Involved.	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

Cases — Pae

Alden v. Mayfield, 33 Cal. App. 724, 166 Pac. 382 5

Armstrong v. Manzo, 14 L. Ed. 2d 62, 380 U.S. 545, 85 S. Ct. 1187 12

Aspen Mining & Smelting Co. v. Billings, Colo., 14 S. Ct. 4, 150 U.S. 31, 37 L. Ed. 986 11

Edwards v. California, 314 U.S. 160, 86 L. Ed. 119, 62 S. Ct. 164 3

Finn v. Chase Nat. Bank of City of New York, 26 N.Y.S. 2d 771, 176 Misc. 127 12

Goodrich v. Ferris, 29 S. Ct. 580, 214 U.S. 71, 53 L. Ed. 914 .... 9, 12

Hyman v. Ross, 84 N.Y.S. 2d 102, aff'd 87 N.Y.S. 2d 422 13

McLaughlin v. McLaughlin, 133 N.J. Eq. 72, 20 A. 2d 49 12

Michigan-Wisconsin Pipe Line Co. v. Calvert, 347 U.S. 157, 98 L. Ed. 583, 74 S. Ct. 396 3

Robins v. Robert Lawrence Electronics Corp., 84 N.Y.S 2d 99 13

Roller v. Holly, 20 S. Ct. 410, 176 U.S. 398, 44 L. Ed. 520 .... 9, 12

Shroeder v. New York, 371 U.S. 208, 9 L. Ed. 2d 255, 83 S. Ct. 279, 89 A.L.R. 2d 1398 12

Snidach v. Family Finance Corpporation, 89 S. Ct. 1820, 395 U.S. 337, 23 L. Ed. 349 8

State v. Mueller, 388 S.W. 2d 53 13

Steinhart v. Superior Court, 137 Cal. 575, 70 Pac. 629 9

Page

System Meat Company v. Steward, 122 N.W. 2d 1, 175 Neb. 387 12

United States v. Seminole Nation, 57 S. Ct. 283, 299 U.S. 417, 81 L. Ed. 316 11

Rules

California Rules of Court, Rule 63 .....3, 4

California Rules of Court, Rule 105 .....4, 5, 9

California Rules of Court, Rule 107 10

California Rules of Court, Rule 122 7

California Rules of Court, Rule 127 8

California Rules of Court, Rule 501 .....4, 5

Statutes

California Code of Civil Procedure, Sec. 77 .....2, 4

California Code of Civil Procedure, Sec. 89 .....2, 3

California Code of Civil Procedure, Sec. 437 .....4, 5

California Code of Civil Procedure, Sec. 911 .....3, 4

California Code of Civil Procedure, Sec. 1161 ....2, 3

California Code of Civil Procedure, Sec. 1166 .....2, 3

California Code of Civil Procedure, Sec. 1167 ..2, 3, 5 .....10, 11, 12, 15

California Code of Civil Procedure, Sec. 1169 ....2, 3

California Code of Civil Procedure, Sec. 1174 ..2, 3, 5

California Constitution, Art. VI, Sec. 5 .....2, 4

California Constitution, Art. VI, Sec. 11 .....2, 3, 4

United States Code, Title 28, Sec. 1257(2) 3, 4

United States Code, Title 28, Sec. 2101(c) 3, 4

United States Constitution, Fourteenth Amendment 3, 10, 13

Textbook

6 American Law Reports 3d, pp. 177, 186 14

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1969

No. .....

CORA MCKINNON,

Appellant,

vs.

WILLIE BROWN,

Appellee.

On Appeal From the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Riverside (Appellate Department).

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT.

Appellant, Cora McKinnon, appeals from the judgment of the Superior Court of the State of California for Riverside County (Appellate Department), entered December 18, 1969, and made final on December 30, 1969, affirming a judgment of the Municipal Court of the Riverside Judicial District, State of California. Appellant submits this Statement to show that the Supreme Court of the United States has jurisdiction of the appeal and that a substantial question is presented.

Opinion Below.

Neither the judgment of the Court of first instance below, nor the decision on appeal affirming that judgment was accompanied by an opinion. Nor was the appellate court's denial of appellant's motion for trans-